

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on May 26, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-5, 9, 10, and 13-26 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21-23, and 25 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Comiskey, et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,072). Applicant does not admit that the Comiskey, et al. reference is prior art and reserves the right to swear behind the same at a later date.

Applicant's independent claim 1, as amended, recites, besides other things:

a user interface device for enabling the electronic paper display to present a user with a plurality of reference images grouped for display on the electronic paper display device during a whiteboard session to assist the user in drawing on the writing surface over a selected one of the plurality of reference images wherein the selected one of the plurality of reference images can include an image selected from the group: a single image, a partial image, a single image displayed as partial images at different times during the whiteboard session.

Applicant's independent claim 10, as amended, recites, besides other things:

enabling a user to select a predefined image from the plurality of reference images for display on the electronic paper display device during a whiteboard session, where the predefined image assists the user in drawing on the writing surface over the predefined image displayed by the electronic paper display, wherein the predefined image can include an image selected from the group: a single image, a partial image, a single image displayed as partial images at different times during the whiteboard session.

From a review of the Comiskey, et al. reference, the Applicant was unable to locate a description of the embodiments claimed in claims 1 and 10. The Comiskey, et al. reference appears to teach transferring images to the drawing screen using a sliding bar having an electrostatic printhead. (See Col. 16, lines 55-65 of the Comiskey, et al. reference).

In contrast, the Comiskey, et al. reference does not teach a plurality of reference images grouped for display on the electronic paper display device during a whiteboard session to assist the user in drawing on the writing surface over a selected one of the plurality of reference images wherein the selected one of the plurality of reference images can include an image selected from the group: a single image, a partial image, and a single image displayed as partial images at different times during the whiteboard session, as recited by Applicant's independent claim 1. Further, the Comiskey, et al. reference does not teach enabling a user to select a predefined image from the plurality of reference images for display on the electronic paper display device during a whiteboard session, where the predefined image assists the user in drawing on the writing surface over the predefined image displayed by the electronic paper display, wherein the predefined image can include an image selected from the group: a single image, a partial image, and a single image displayed as partial images at different times during the whiteboard session.

As such, each and every element and limitation as recited in Applicant's independent claims 1 and 10 are not shown in the Comiskey, et al. reference. As such, the Comiskey, et al. reference cannot support the §102 rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection for claims 1 and 10, as well as those claims which depend therefrom.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 20 and 24 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Comiskey, et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,072). Claims 5, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Comiskey, et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,072) in view of Chery, et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,177,927). Claims 17 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Comiskey, et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,072) in view of applicant's prior art (APA).

Claims 5 and 20 are dependent upon claim 1 and claims 14, 15, 17, 24, and 26 are dependent upon claim 10. The Chery reference and applicant's prior art, as asserted by the Examiner, do not cure the deficiencies of the Comiskey, et al. reference. Accordingly, since these claims depend from allowable

independent claims 1 and 10, respectively. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejections of the above dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Gregg W. Wisdom at (360) 212-8052 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS AMENDMENT Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 26th day of August, 2005.

Sarah L. Reinhard
Name

Sarah L. Reinhard
Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
Chad Stevens, et al.

By their Representatives,
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By: [Signature]
Jeffery L. Cameron
Reg. No. 43,527

Date: 8/26/05